

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-13 and 17 are pending in the current application. In the Office Action dated July 9, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 7,383,127 (“Matsuo”); rejected claims 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo; rejected claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,914,605 (“Loughmiller”); rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo in view of what the Examiner asserts is admitted prior art; and rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0156739 (“Hirari”). Finally, the Examiner indicated that claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

II. Matsuo Does Not Render Claim 1 Unpatentable

Amended independent claim 1 generally recites:

a simple-map drawing unit operable to generate simple-map image data for presentation of a simple map image of at least two main roads extending from a map image inside a window to outside of the window; and

an image combining unit operable to display the map image inside the window and the simple image of the at least two main roads extending from the map image inside the window to outside of the window on the monitor screen;

wherein the map image in the window is presented in greater detail than the simple map image located outside of the window.

Matsuo fails to teach these elements.

Matsuo is directed to a navigation apparatus for receiving delivered information. The Examiner asserts that Figs. 8, 9, and 12 of Matsuo teach a simple image of a main road extending from a map image in a window, and that it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify Matsuo to display a simple image with two main roads extending from a map image in a window. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Figs. 8, 9, and 12 of Matsuo, and the corresponding discussion in Col. 11, lines 49-61 of Matsuo, a navigation apparatus may present a map illustrating an area around a current position of a vehicle (reference numeral 3000), an area around a destination of the vehicle (reference numeral 3010), and a recommended route (reference numeral 3020) extending from the current position of the vehicle to the destination. Applicant maintains that the recommended route extending outside a detailed map in Matsuo is not equivalent to a main road extending from a detailed map inside a window to a simple map outside the window. As shown in Fig. 8, a road does not appear to extend from the map illustrating an area around a current position of a vehicle (reference numeral 3000). Instead, a line that generally represents a recommended route extends from the map illustrating an area around a current position of a vehicle. There is no discussion in the cited portion of Matsuo of a module that is operable to generate simple-image data for presentation of a simple map image of at least two roads extending from a map image inside a window to outside of the window, nor is there a discussion in the cited portions of Matsuo of a module that is operable to display a map image inside the window and a simple image of at least two roads extending from the map image inside the window to outside the window on a monitor screen, where the map image in the window is presented in greater detail than the simple map image located outside the window.

Additionally, Applicant notes that claim 1 recites at least two main roads extend from a map image inside a window to outside of the window, where the map image in the window is presented in greater detail than the simple map image located outside the window. The cited portions of Matsuo fail to teach at least two recommended routes (the purported main roads) extending from a detailed map located in a window to a simple map image located outside the window. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that it would be obvious in light of Matsuo to display two main roads extending from a detailed map located in a window to a simple map image located outside the window. Applicants respectfully disagree. In the cited portions of Matsuo, a recommended route (the purported main road) is shown extending from a map illustrating a current position of a vehicle. The cited portions of Matsuo fail to teach or suggest illustrating two recommended routes extending from a detailed map located in a

window to a simple map image located outside the window, nor has the Examiner explained how the Matsuo would illustrate two recommended routes extending from a detailed map located in a window to a simple map image located outside the window. In claim 1 at least two main roads extend from a detailed map located in a window to a simple map image located outside the window rather than two main roads simply being displayed outside the detailed map located in the window.

Matsuo fails to teach a simple-map drawing unit operable to generate simple-map image data for presentation of a simple map image of at least two main roads extending from a map image inside a window to outside of the window, and an image combining unit operable to display the map image inside the window and the simple image of the at least two main roads extending from the map image inside the window to outside of the window on the monitor screen, wherein the map image in the window is presented in greater detail than the simple map image located outside of the window. For at least this reason, Matsuo does not anticipate, or render obvious, independent claim 1 or any claim that depends on claim 1. For at least this same reason, the proposed combination of Matsuo and Loughmiller does not render unpatentable independent claim 1 or any claim that depends on claim 1.

III. Matsuo Does Not Render Claim 12 Unpatentable

Amended independent claim 12 generally recites a window portion provided at a predetermined position on a monitor screen operable to display a map image generated in a designated scale and a simple image portion of the monitor screen external to the window portion, the simple image portion operable to display a simple map image of at least two main roads extending from the map image of the window portion to outside the window portion. As discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, Matsuo fails to teach at least two recommended routs (the purported main road) extending outside a map image. Accordingly, Matsuo fails to teach the above-recited elements of claim 12.

For at least this reason, Matsuo does not anticipate, or render obvious, independent claim 12 or any claim that depends on claim 12. For at least this same reason, the proposed combination of Matsuo and Hirari does not render unpatentable independent claim 12 or any claim that depends on claim 12.

IV. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition of allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Amendment, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott W. Brim/
Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200